



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/023,008	12/12/2001	Igor Davidovich Kushnirskiy	0007056-0233/P6791	2453

58328 7590 11/30/2006

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
FOR SUN MICROSYSTEMS
P.O. BOX 061080
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER

TRUONG, LECHI

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2194

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/023,008

Applicant(s)KUSHNIRSKIY, IGOR
DAVIDOVICH**Examiner**

LeChi Truong

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,5-15,17-27 and 29-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 3, 6-15, 18, 19, 21-27, 28-31, 33-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 5,8,17,20,29 and 32 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 2, 3, 5-15, 17-27, 29-37 are presented for the examination. Claims 1, 4, 16, 28 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 3, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of John Bandhauer (A zero generated code XPConnect proposal).
3. As to claim 3, APA teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a non-scriptable plug-in API (plug-in APIs are non-scriptable, page 2, ln 4-7), a scriptable plug-in APA (scripting languages, page 2, ln 5-9/page 4, ln 17-19).
4. APA does not explicitly teach a cross platform language API, a first interface operatively configured to connect said across platform language API and said scriptable language, a second interface operatively to connect said non-scriptable plug-in and said platform language API, scriptable language API is able to access said non-scriptable. However, John teaches a cross platform language API (across XPCOM interface, sec: introduction, ln 1-3/ XPCOM method call, sec: Proxies, ln 9-10), a first interface operatively configured to connect said across platform language API and said scriptable language (XPConnect is an evolving technology with

Art Unit: 2194

enables JavaScript code to call across XPCOM interface, sec: introduction, ln 1-3) a second interface operatively to connect said non-scriptable plug-in and said platform language API (XPConnect ... also C++ to call across interfaces, sec: introduction, ln 1-3) , scriptable language is able to access said non-scriptable(JavaScript code to call across XPCOM interface into C++ object, sec: introduction, ln 1-3/ JavaScript code access C++XPCOM object, sec: Proxy, ln 1-5).

4. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of APA and John because John's a cross platform language API, a first interface, a second interface would improve the efficiency of APA's system by allowing the IDL compiler to demonstrate how to either implement or access a given interface from JavaScript.

5. As to **claims 37**, it is apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above. In additional, John teaches bridges (one more interfaces, sec: InterfaceInfo Files and object, ln 6-7/ proxies, sec: Proxies, ln 1-5).

6. Claims **2, 9, 10, 13-15, 21-22, 25-26, 27, 33-36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of John Bandhauer (A zero generated code XPConnect proposal), as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Lewallen (US. Patent 6,854,123 B1).

7. As to **claim 2**, APA and John do not teach each of said bridges connects a respective one of the said first interfaces to respective one of said second interface. However, Lewallen teaches

Art Unit: 2194

each of said bridges connects a respective one of the said first interfaces to respective one of said second interface (col 10, ln 51-57).

8. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of APA, John and Lewallen because Lewallen's a plurality of bridges that a scriptable plug-in program is able to access to the non-scriptable plug-in API in response to implementing the scriptable plug-in API would improve the efficiency of APA and John's systems by allowing the java developer to utilize the API interface standards to access non-Java components in the operating system.

9. As to claim 9, APA teaches a JavaScript object, a perl object, a Python object (sec: Plug-In API, ln 4-6).

10. As to claim 10, Lewallen teaches XPCOM (col 6, ln 58-61).

11. As to claims 13, 14, they are apparatus claims of claims 1, 2; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 2 above.

12. As to claim 15, it is an apparatus claim of claim 3; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 3 above. In additional, APA teaches obtaining (create, page 2, ln 4-7).

13. As to claims 21, 22, they are apparatus claims of claims 9, 10; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 9, 10 above.

14. As to claims 25, 26, they are apparatus claims of claims 1, 2; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 2 above.

15. As to claims 27, 33-36, they are apparatus claims of claims 15, 17, 9, 10, 23, 24; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 15, 17, 9, 10, 23, 24 above.

Art Unit: 2194

16. Claims **6-7, 18-19, 30-31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of John Bandhauer (A zero generated code XPConnect proposal), as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of XP (XPCom).

17. As to **claim 6**, APA and John do not teach XPIDL interface. However, XP teaches XPIDL interface (XPIDL, page 2, ln 14-16).

18. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching APA, John and XP because XP's XPIDL interface would improve the efficiency of APA and John's systems by allowing the compiler to compile the files to produce a cross platform binary type library.

19. As to **claim 7**, XP teaches a second interface is XPconnect interface (XPconnect, page 2, section: XPConnect and the Component object, ln 1-3).

20. As to **claims 18-19, 30-31**, they are apparatus claims of claims 6-8; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 6-8 above.

21. Claims **11, 12, 23, 24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over in view of John Bandhauer (A zero generated code XPConnect proposal) in view of Wu (US. Patent 6,766,333 B1).

22. As to **claim 11**, John teaches a scriptable (JavaScript code, sec: Proxies, ln 1-5), a proxy support interfaces (proxies object, sec: Proxies, ln 1-5), said scriptable can perform inter-thread calls through said proxy support interface (sec: Proxies, ln 1-5).

Art Unit: 2194

23. John does not explicitly teach plug-in API can issues a call. However, Wu teaches plug-in API can issue a call (DAM 516 issues DOM API calls to the DOM API 512, col 11, ln 56-57/ DAM 516 may be provided as script, applet, plug-in, col 11, ln 56 –57).

28. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of John and Wu because Wu's plug-in API would improve the use of MO 'system by enhancing a standard protocol or providing their own protocol for transmitting of data.

24. As to claim 12, John teaches proxy support interface is an nsIsupports proxy (sec: Proxies, ln 1-5/ ln 16-17).

25. As to claims 23, 24, they are apparatus claims of claims 11, 12; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 11, 12 above.

Allowable Subject Matter

26. Claims 5, 8, 17, 20, 29, 32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272 3767. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2194

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

LeChi Truong

November 22, 2006


LECHI T. TRUONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ELECTRONIC BUSINESS CENTER 2100